

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/711,544
Docket No.: 13529-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The office action stated applicant has claimed a foreign priority based on an application filed in Taiwan on 9/24/2004, but applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 93123441 application as required. The specification is objected to because a new title is required. The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Urabe (US 2004/0090175). The Office Action also rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urabe in view of Fery (US 2004/0075115).

In response thereto, applicant has explained the present application did not claim any foreign priority. In addition, applicant has amended the title according to the Examiner's suggestion.

Applicant has also amended claim 1 and canceled claim 2 to more clearly define the present invention. The limitation added in claim 1 is described in paragraph [0027], and no new matter is entered. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1, 3-8 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Objections

The specification is objected to because a new title is required. Applicant has amended the title to "Active Matrix Organic Electroluminescent Display Panel Having Partition Rib and Patterned Anode, Cathode and Organic Light Emitting Layer" that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claimed are directed.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/711,544
Docket No.: 13529-US-PA

Rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 (e)

Applicant respectfully traverses the 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7-8 because Urabe (US 2004/0090175) does not teach every element recited in these claims.

In order to properly anticipate Applicants' claimed invention under 35 U.S.C 102, each and every element of claim in issue must be found, "either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference". "The identical invention must be shown in as complete details as is contained in the claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F. 2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)." See M.P.E.P. 2131, 8th ed., 2001.

The present invention is in general related an active matrix organic electro-luminescent display panel as claim 1 recites:

Claim 1. An active matrix organic electro-luminescent display panel, comprising:
a pixel structure layer, disposed on a substrate, wherein the pixel structure layer comprises an active device matrix and an anode pattern layer;
an organic light-emitting layer, disposed at least over the anode pattern layer, wherein the organic light-emitting layer comprises at least a first organic light-emitting pattern, at least a second organic light-emitting pattern and at least a third organic light-emitting pattern; and
a cathode layer, disposed on the organic light-emitting layer, wherein the cathode layer comprises a first cathode pattern disposed on the first organic light-emitting pattern, a second cathode pattern disposed on the second organic light-emitting pattern and a third cathode pattern disposed on the third organic light-emitting pattern, and the first, the second and the third cathode patterns are not connected to each other, ***and the first, the second and the third cathode pattern are electrically connected to different operation voltages.***

Urabe fails to disclose, teach or suggest the first, the second and the third cathode pattern are electrically connected to different operation voltages. Please see paragraph [0053], Urabe teaches after the evaporation of the organic layer 10, the transparent cathode K is formed on the

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/711,544
Docket No.: 13529-US-PA

whole surface of the substrate 1. The electric potential of the cathode K is kept to be a common value over all of the pixels. In addition, please see paragraph [0072]-[0073], Urabe disclosed Fig. 5 is an equivalent circuit of *one pixel*, and the pixel is composed of an OLED, a TFT1, a TFT 2 and a capacitance Cs, and the cathode K of the OLED is connected to a supply voltage Vdd. Urabe also disclosed when many pixels like this (Fig. 5) are arranged in a matrix from as shown in Fig. 6, an active matrix type display apparatus can be constituted. That is, the cathode of OLED in all of the pixels is connected to the supply voltage Vdd. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits the cathode of OLED in the Urabe reference is connected to a single voltage (such as a common voltage or a supply voltage Vdd). Urabe fails to disclose, teach or suggest the first, the second and the third cathode pattern are electrically connected to different operation voltages as claim 1 recites.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 patently define over the prior art reference, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 3-5, 7-8 patently define over the prior art as a matter of law, for at least the reason that these dependent claims contain all features of their respective independent claim.

In particular, regarding to claim 3, the office action stated Urabe has disclosed cathodes lines (X1, X2...) electrically connected to the first, second and third cathode pattern respectively (Fig. 6). However, applicant respectfully disagrees. As a matter of fact, the lines X1, X2.. are scanning wires (see paragraph [0076]). The scanning wire is connected to the gate G of the TFT 1 in one of the pixel (see paragraph [0073]), and thus these lines X1, X2 shown in Fig. 6 are not

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/711,544
Docket No.: 13529-US-PA

as cathode lines because these lines X1, X2 are not electrically connected to the cathode of OLED.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C 103 (a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 6 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urabe in view of Fery (US 2004/0075115) because a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the Office Action.

Applicant submits that, as disclosed above, Urabe fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1 from which claim 6 depend. Fery also fails to disclose, teach or suggest the first, the second and the third cathode pattern are electrically connected to different operation voltages as discussed above. Fery cannot cure the deficiencies of Urabe. Therefore, independent claim 1 is patentable over Urabe and Fery. For at the least the same reasons, dependent claim 6 is also patentable as a matter of law.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/711,544
Docket No.: 13529-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: *Sept. 21, 2006*

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw